



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,073	04/08/2004	Aurobinda Pradhan	13906-191001 / 2003P00966	9212
32864	7590	10/16/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 10/16/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/821,073	PRADHAN, AUROBINDA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/14/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This is a Final rejection in response to application filed on 7/14/2006.
- 2) Claims 1-20 are pending and rejected below.
- 3) Effective filing date 4/8/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4-1) Claims 1, 2, 6, 7-10, 12-15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (US 6313855, issued Nov 6, 2001).

Regarding claims 1, 12, and 14, Shuping teaches displaying a view of a selected electronic document on a graphical user interface, the selected document having the intrinsic association with at least one other electronic document. For example, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (see Fig 4, items 410, 450) where multiple web pages are contemporaneously displayed in a single window for a user to view (Abstract section). The current web page is displayed in the second panel and identifies a hyperlink (which examiner interprets as a user selectable command to go to another linked page) in the current page to retrieve and render the future web page in a third panel, all embedded within a single window (Abstract section).

Shuping does not expressly teach displaying on the graphical user interface while displaying the view of the selected electronic document, a user-selectable command that identifies the intrinsic association and causes a view of the other electronic document that is intrinsically associated with the selected electronic document to be displayed on the graphical user interface. But one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have thought it was obvious based on Shuping's disclosure. Shuping discloses, in the method for web browsing, while the current page is displayed, the user selecting the "backward" navigation button on the tool bar of the browser, which navigates user through the past history of the web page. The past pages and current pages are associated by the history of the browser (col 1, lines 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a backward navigation button on the tool bar of the browser which allowed for navigation to pages prior the current page as taught by Shuping, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Shuping teaches the user-selectable command is displayed in response to a user selecting an input control in a toolbar of the graphical user interface. For example, the "backward" button on a tool bar that is selected by a user to command the browser to link and pull up the previous page (col 1, lines 60-61).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Shuping does not expressly teach the electronic documents forming a hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines

Art Unit: 2176

15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the past web page is equivalent to going to a parent page or one upward (or prior) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a

Art Unit: 2176

current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment

(Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 8 and 20, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the future web page is equivalent to going to a child page or one down (or future) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Shuping teaches receiving a predetermined ... command.

For example, the "backwards" button is a command on the tool bar which is existing before and provides user with functionality (col 1, lines 59-63).

Shuping teaches in response to receiving ... one other electronic document. For example, upon user selecting the "backwards" command, displaying the past web pages prior to the current page (col 1, lines 59-63)

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 10, Shuping teaches ceasing to display ... other electronic document.

For example, in a conventional browser, upon the user selecting the “backward” button, the conventional browser stops displaying the “current” web page and moves on to display the immediately previous web page (col 2, lines 15-22).

4-2) Claims 3, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (as cited above), in view of Patil et al (US 6489975, issued Dec 3, 2002).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Shuping teaches displaying on the graphical user interface a plurality of user-selectable commands for displaying views of the plurality of other documents, each of the plurality of user-selectable commands identifying the respective intrinsic association. For example, the “backward” button on a tool bar that is selected by a user to command the browser to link and pull up the previous page (col 1, lines 60-61).

Shuping does not expressly teach the selected document is associated with each of other electronic documents. But Patil does teach it. For example, the Bar (item 40) shows the backward button (item 46) and forward button (item 48). That show past and future pages (Patil, see Fig 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shuping to include a tool bar multiple commands as shown in Patil, with the motivation to combine because Shuping teaches navigation buttons on a tool bar of conventional web browsers (Shuping, col 1, lines 60-62).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding claim 11, Shuping does not expressly teach displaying another user-selectable command on the graphical user interface that identifies the intrinsic association and causes the view of the selected document to be displayed on the graphical user interface. But Patil does teach it. For example, the refresh button (item 52) causes the current page to be displayed with more recent data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shuping to include a tool bar multiple commands and one command for refreshing the current page displayed as shown in Patil, with the motivation to combine because Shuping teaches navigation buttons on a tool bar of conventional web browsers (Shuping, col 1, lines 60-62).

4-3) Claims 4, 5, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (as cited above), in view of Patil et al (as cited above), further in view of Pirolli et al (US 5895470, issued Apr 1999).

Claim 4, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between selected electronic document and each of the plurality of other electronic documents belong to any of a plurality of association categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents where the system obtains the topology and usage information for documents in order to classify/categorize (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a

Art Unit: 2176

user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

Claim 5, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between ... categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35). The examiner interprets links as equivalent to commands because a link is a user selected command to fetch the point to document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

Claim 17, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between ... categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents where the system obtains the topology and usage information for documents in order to classify/categorize (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/14/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the amended independent claims are not taught by Shuping. Specifically, applicant argues that that Shuping does not teach two documents having an intrinsic association that is identified by a user-selectable command (Remarks, page 7). The Examiner disagrees. Shuping discloses, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (see Fig 4, items 410, 450) where multiple web pages are contemporaneously displayed in a single window for a user to view (Abstract section). The current web page is displayed in the second panel and identifies a hyperlink (which examiner interprets as a user selectable command to go to another linked page) in the current page to retrieve and render the future web page in a third panel, all embedded within a single window (Abstract section). The examiner equates Shuping identifying a hyperlink in the current web page as equivalent to the identifying intrinsic association with another electronic document because a hyperlink is linked to retrieve a future web page that is displayed in another panel (Abstract section).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GS 9/30/06
GS


Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner